



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,659	01/02/2002	Tanya Couch	SVL920010074US1/2304P	6531

7590 08/01/2005

SAWYER LAW GROUP
P.O. Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

BETIT, JACOB F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/037,659

Applicant(s)

COUCH ET AL.

Examiner

Jacob F. Betit

Art Unit

2164

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments made in the request for reconsideration filed 14 July 2005 have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive:

In response to the applicant's arguments that "Drexler does not teach or suggest storing 'a table function in the database system' or 'storing the invocation mechanism in a database'" and "Drexler also fails to suggest 'invoking the table function from within the database system'... or an 'invocation mechanism [that] is invocable by the database'", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The applicant argues that the words "database" and "database system" are interchangeable, and that "a 'database' is defined as a set of related files that is created and managed by a database management system (DBMS). These arguments seem to show just how broadly the word database can be interpreted. The applicant is saying with one argument that a database is the same as a database system and with the next that a database is a set of files managed by a database management system. According to MPEP 2106(II)(C):

"Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. > E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily).< In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). See also In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow.... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed.... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process.").

The examiner has done this when examining this application and has interpreted "database" and "database system" as the system that includes the hardware that performs the action of storing data; the instructions, software, or programs running on the hardware that cause it to perform the action of storing data; and the hardware that actually does the data storing. Since the claims do not clearly point out what part of this system is storing a table function or storing an invocation mechanism and what part of the system invokes the table function or what part of the system the invocation mechanism is located the rejection is still deemed proper under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for claims 1, 27, 53, 67, 75, and 83 using the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. There is nothing in the claims or in the prior art that contests the examiners broad interpretation of the claims that the database system is the entire system on which a database application is being run.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "nothing teaches or suggests that the association transforms the messaging data 'into the relation table format'", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. Microsoft Access™ is a relational database with rows and columns well known in the art. WordPerfect™ is not a word processing program also well known in the art. Drexler specifically discloses converting from WordPerfect™ type data to Microsoft Access™ type data as the examiner stated in the previous office action.

In response to the applicant's arguments towards claims the dependent claims, the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because they seem to be directed on the applicant's narrow interpretation of the term database/database system and not on the reasonably broad interpretation given by the examiner.